## **United States Court of Appeals**

## FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

	No. 10-3382
United States of America,	*
Appellee, v.	<ul> <li>* Appeal from the United States</li> <li>* District Court for the</li> <li>* Northern District of Iowa.</li> </ul>
Gary Lee Brooks,	* * [UNPUBLISHED]
Appellant.	*
	Submitted: March 22, 2011 Filed: April 4, 2011

Before MELLOY, GRUENDER, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Gary Brooks pleaded guilty to conspiring to distribute actual methamphetamine and possessing with intent to distribute a methamphetamine mixture, both within 1,000 feet of a public playground, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A), (B), 846, and 860(a). The district court¹ sentenced him to the statutory minimum prison term of 120 months. Brooks appeals. His counsel has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising the argument that the government

Appellate Case: 10-3382 Page: 1 Date Filed: 04/04/2011 Entry ID: 3772988

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Donald E. O'Brien, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

acted in bad faith in refusing to move under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(e) for a sentence reduction based on substantial assistance.

The challenge to the sentence is unavailing: there is no indication in the record that the government's decision not to move for a sentence reduction was improper. See United States v. Wattree, 431 F.3d 618, 624 (8th Cir. 2005) (so long as government's refusal to file substantial-assistance motion is not motivated by bad faith or unconstitutional motive, court cannot order government to file motion); United States v. Chacon, 330 F.3d 1065, 1066 (8th Cir. 2003) (only authority for district court to depart from statutory minimum sentence is found in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(e) and (f), applicable only when government makes substantial-assistance motion or defendant qualifies for safety-valve relief); United States v. Mendoza, 876 F.2d 639, 641 (8th Cir. 1989) (mandatory minimum sentencing does not violate defendant's constitutional rights).

Having independently reviewed the record under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we affirm.

-2-